

MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARIES OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS
CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (COMPTROLLER)
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (COMMAND,

CONTROL,

COMMUNICATIONS & INTELLIGENCE)
GENERAL COUNSEL
INSPECTOR GENERAL
DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST AND

EVALUATION

DIRECTORS OF THE DEFENSE AGENCIES

SUBJECT: Questions and Answers from the DoD Offsite Conference:
"Institutionalizing IPTs:
DoD's Commitment to Change"

Thank you all for helping make our July 20, 1995, offsite, "Institutionalizing Integrated Product Teams: DoD's Commitment to Change," a big success. As you know, my major objective in holding the offsite was to develop a common understanding within the Department of how we will implement the IPT concept. As a result of the presentations and discussions at the offsite, I believe we took a major step forward in achieving that common understanding.

An important part of the offsite was the panel discussion held in the afternoon. I was very encouraged not only by the candor of the OSD and Component panelists but also by the enthusiasm of the audience, who asked many very important questions. Indeed, there were so many questions that time did not permit the panelists to address them all during the conference. Accordingly, I directed my staff to distribute the questions to the appropriate officials and to generate written answers. The results are attached. We concentrated on the questions most frequently asked and most directly pertinent to the subject of implementing IPTs.

Thank you again for your participating in the offsite. Building trust and teamwork is a topic of central importance to our ongoing acquisition reform efforts. We are now developing "customer surveys" to ask for and obtain periodic feedback on how this process is working as it evolves. Please feel free to share with me - in writing - your assessments of how well the IPT concept is being implemented.

Paul G. Kaminski

Attachment

Copy to:
A&T PSAs

IPT Off-Site Questions & Responses

VISION

Question: What is your vision of the milestone review process when the Integrated Product Team (IPT) concept is fully implemented?

Answer: While the ACAT I-D process is described for illustration, all other ACAT level programs should follow a similar process within the Services. The objective of the IPT process is to eliminate sequential and redundant program reviews – by the Program Executive Officer (PEO), the Service staff, the Service Acquisition Executive (SAE), the OSD staff, and finally by the Defense Acquisition Executive (DAE). The end-state IPT process will consist of the Service staff working with the OSD staff along side of and in support of the Program Manager (PM), building successful programs. Their collective knowledge and experience will facilitate programs that have affordable and executable strategies and plans from the outset. All participants will have a stake in making the Department's program successful--not finding fault with a program late in a cycle. At the Overarching IPT (OIPT) level, the senior staff from the Service and OSD will jointly resolve issues and review a program's readiness to proceed to the next phase. We can eliminate the need for the Services to conduct a separate program review before sending the program to a DAB. We will work together, the Services and OSD as one Department, to develop strong programs, address issues in a timely and productive manner, and make joint, sound business decisions regarding a program's future course. Diminishing funding and personnel resources mandate that we operate this way. We must work together, capitalizing on each others' knowledge and experience, to get the greatest return possible on our investments. The IPT process is designed to achieve that objective.

Question: Two divergent and potentially conflicting understandings were evident in the dialogue with respect to OSD staff roles under the IPT approach. Some of the staff view the major benefit of IPT participation to be early identification and reconciliation of issues to ensure program success. Others view the major benefit to be a better way to achieve program oversight. This is a major philosophical difference in perspective which can make the difference between success or failure of the initiative. Oversight/independent assessment is obviously still a role which OSD must play for a multitude of reasons, however it is essential for OSD leadership to clearly articulate the relative priority of "early identification and reconciliation of issues to ensure program success" and "enhanced oversight." Both are by-products of IPT operation, but only the

former is a fundamental change in OSD staff roles. Can you clarify Dr. Kaminski's priorities for the role of the staff in working with IPTs?

Answer: Working as teams to develop strategies and early identification and reconciliation of issues to ensure program success is the number one priority of IPTs. An additional benefit of working early with the program teams is that early insight to the program issues will result in better oversight and allow for more informed independent assessments. While oversight/independent assessments are very important, they are the by-product of working as IPTs and should not be the staff's primary focus.

THE ROLE OF IPTS IN RELATION TO DECISIONMAKERS

Question: Early and continuous participation of the OIPT could conceivably lead to defacto program management by committee. In your view, what are the boundaries of responsibility between the OIPT and the PM? What is your intent regarding maintaining the distinction between line and staff organizations?

Answer: The working level IPTs are advisory groups, supporting the PM to develop and recommend program strategies and plans. The OIPT, comprised of senior service and OSD staff and functional directors, provides strategic guidance to the PM and PEO. All IPT members must have the authority to represent their organization's position. The Program Manager is in charge of the program – the PM is the decision-maker.

Question: How do you respond to the position that cost performance, Test & Evaluation, and other proposed IPTs are not really IPTs because they are too focused and not really integrated with other (and sometimes competing) program issues and concerns?

Answer: Each of these IPTs is focused on a particular process, but each is multi-disciplinary, containing representation from different organizations (e.g. user, logistics, systems engineering, etc.) and different levels (OSD, Service, Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO), Syscom, PM) in order to effectively integrate the various functional perspectives into an affordable, executable process that is tailored to the individual program. Also, each Service will establish a management or integrating IPT to integrate the efforts and resolve issues resulting from other working level IPTs. IAW the Program Manager's Bill of Rights, that Integrating IPT will normally be led by the PM, who

is responsible for the overall management of his program – unless the SAE decides otherwise.

Question: Clarify the role of the OIPT and working level or weapon system IPT as they relate to the execution chain of command (i.e., DAE-SAE-PEO-PM). If these IPTs are in the oversight and review mode are they advisors to the DAE, SAE, PEO, and PM or do you believe they will also be making decisions which are binding on the PEO and PM?

Answer: OSD staff members on working level IPTs have an advisory relationship with the PM, but they are also charged with the responsibility to raise issues when they are identified. Issues/concerns must first be raised at the working level IPT in consultation with the functional principal if required. However, if the issues cannot be resolved in the working level IPT, the issue can be raised to the OIPT. The OIPT works during the development phase to streamline documentation and the review process, to resolve issues resulting from working level discussions, and is also responsible for providing to the DAE an independent assessment of a program's readiness to proceed at the end of the phase. The PM and PEO will be actively involved at both levels in the resolution of any issues. For the process to operate as designed, agreements must be binding. However, disagreements will be resolved at the lowest possible level, but can be raised at any time to higher levels, including the DAE, for a final decision. We would view issues that should have been raised earlier, but were not surfaced until the last minute, to be a failure of the new IPT process.

ROLE OF STAFFS

Question: Air Force's IPT model suggests that the staff level IPT deal with issues and processes only, but not program execution. This is different from what Mr. Longuemare has proposed. Are we free to choose any IPT model as we see fit?

Answer: There is no one-size-fits-all working-level IPT model. While each of the services is developing a slightly different approach, there are three basic tenets that any approach must adhere: (1) As Dr. Kaminski emphasized at the July 20 IPT Off-site, and per the PM Bill of Rights and Responsibilities, the PM is in charge of his or her own program; (2) working level IPTs are advisory bodies to the PM--responsible to and empowered by the PM; (3) direct communication among all levels in the acquisition process is encouraged as a

means of exchanging information and building trust. The USD(A&T) and the Component Acquisition Executives (CAEs) have a responsibility to review and make decisions on certain programs. IPTs do not supplant that responsibility.

Question: From briefings on 20 July it is not clear whether the OIPTs will include service principal office representatives which are counterparts of the OSD principal office representatives. If they are not to be included it would encourage a parallel OIPT to be established at the service level—this would not reflect an integrated approach. Please comment.

Answer: ACAT ID OIPTs and working level IPTs will include service and OSD staff and functional representatives. The intent is to be inclusive vice exclusive. The purpose of IPTs is to build successful programs, i.e., develop affordable executable strategies and plans, and to identify and resolve issues early. There will be a parallel structure for ACAT IC and below programs. An objective is to streamline the process such that the OIPT will reduce the need for service level Systems Acquisition Review Council meetings for ACAT ID program decisions. Of course, that decision will be at the discretion of the CAE.

Question: How do we deal with “adversarial” representatives on IPTs (non-team players sabotaging at every turn)?

Answer: Where there are differences of view, those differences should be resolved within the team. When the differences cannot be resolved, those issues should immediately be raised to the next level of decisionmaking. Unprofessional activity will be reviewed and resolved by the responsible supervisors.

Question: We have a perception that this IPT concept is embraced and supported at the top level in OSD, but not at the working levels of the OSD staffs. This makes IPT implementation more difficult and more susceptible to sabotage.

Answer: The use of IPTs is a “win-win” for both top and staff level OSD and PMs. Understanding that skepticism remains, the use of IPTs and the resulting benefits will be reaped by all over time. However, learning the process and becoming comfortable with it also requires time. Be assured that the leadership in OSD, career, political and military, strongly support the IPT process and are committed to making it work. Everyone must embrace the IPT concept and they must now be evaluated on how well they support the process

and contribute to the success of acquisition programs vice finding fault late in the process.

INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENTS

Question: How is the principle of independent assessment compatible with the issue raising/issue resolving principle behind IPTs? Are the independent assessors fully participating members and/or leaders of the IPT--part of the decision making process? Doesn't the principle of independence interfere with the IPT concept and vice versa?

Answer: Independent assessments are compatible and possible within the IPT process. However, within the IPT construct, the independent assessments are a continuous process. Under the old way of doing business, the independent assessments occurred at the end of a program phase: functional elements of the program were "graded" and pass/fail reports were provided to the PM, the Service and OSD functional chiefs, and the Milestone Decision Authority (MDA). Under the IPT concept, the functional representatives, from both the Service and OSD levels, will participate in developing sound, executable, and affordable strategies and plans with an eye towards making the program a success. Both functional representatives and the PM must consider alternative means of reaching objectives. However, if a functional representative cannot agree with an evolving strategy or plan, that representative is duty-bound to seek to resolve and, if necessary, elevate that issue to his functional supervisor and the PM for resolution through the OIPT and ultimately to the DAE if not resolved by the OIPT. Therein, the independent assessment role under the IPT construct has facilitated early resolution of the issue, much earlier and more constructively than it did under the old way of doing business. The issue is identified and resolved quickly, and the program proceeds without undue delay. This role does not in any way compromise the role of OSD as an independent assessor.

DAES

Question: Given the IPT concept, why is service involvement required at DAES reviews - why can't the OSD IPT member address all issues? Why do we still need DAES reviews?

Answer: Basically, the IPT process and the DAES do different things. The IPT/OIPT function is to develop successful program strategies and, through early and continuous insight, identify and resolve problems in a timely, efficient manner. Another important function that must be performed is keeping the USD(A&T) regularly informed regarding the status of the ACAT ID programs for which he is held accountable. DAES serves the function of providing quarterly feedback to MDAs on program execution against baselines as needed for effective oversight between milestones. As a point of clarification, the DAES process started out with only OSD participation in the briefings. The Services, including many PEOs and PMs, have requested participation, and that has been granted on a space available basis. As the IPT process matures, the DAES reporting process may also change to meet the DAE's needs.

GOVERNMENT-CONTRACTOR RELATIONS

Question: How does the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) affect or restrict industry's participation on program office IPTs?

Answer: An "advisory committee," as defined by FACA, includes any committee, panel, task force, or similar group that is established or used by an agency or officer of the Government to obtain advice or recommendations on issues or policies within the scope of the agency official's responsibilities, and whose membership includes anyone other than full-time officers or employees of the Federal Government. A committee, which includes non-government representatives, to provide an industry view, would be an advisory committee covered by FACA and must follow the procedures prescribed by the Act.

In addition to FACA considerations, PMs must also remember that the participation of a contractor or a prospective contractor on an IPT could violate other statutory requirements, such as the statutory procurement integrity rules. For example, involvement by potential contractors on a program IPT during the solicitation process could result in improper access to information. Prospective contractor involvement on IPTs should be reviewed by the Component's legal advisor.

A contractor, as part of an IPT, providing advice to a program office in accordance with the requirements of its contract, generally would not be considered an advisory committee and therefore should not be affected by FACA. However, refer to the question and answer on maintaining contractor responsibility.

Question: How do you hold the contractor responsible for performance when you share every decision he makes? If the contractor doesn't meet specification requirements, isn't the Government responsible?

Answer: The contractor is responsible for executing his/her contract. Changes to the contract require action by both the Procurement Contracting Officer (PCO) and the person designated by the contractor to make changes. IPTs cannot make decisions for the contractor nor direct the contractor in the performance of contract responsibilities. In relation to contractor performance, the purpose of the IPT is to assist the parties in understanding the contract requirements, facilitate timely issue resolution, and to allow the government to gain early insight into the contractor's performance. It must be clear to the contractor that the IPT guidance will not change the contract requirements. Any perceived change to those requirements must be addressed to the PCO for resolution and potential contractual implementation. The Government officials leading the IPT must ensure that these ground rules are clear and spelled out in a way to ensure that they will withstand a challenge.

RESOURCES

Questions: From an OSD Action Officer (AO) (i.e., OSD staff member) perspective, the IPT concept has resulted in a significant added workload. How do we plan to accommodate the added workload? How do you change the mind set of OSD managers to empower AOs to make decisions for their organization?

It seems that some PMs feel that they will have to "staff up" to support IPTs. How do you respond to this? And if it's true, what will the course of action be?

Answer: Staff levels are declining as noted in other questions. It is important to understand that OIPTs and IPTs are not intended to meet regularly nor frequently. Information can be exchanged and members updated through other forums such as phone calls, tele-video conferencing, e-mails, faxes, DAES, etc. When OIPT and IPT meetings are convened, they must be well organized and constructively consume the member's time in supporting the PM. Everyone must use available resources to work smarter, not harder.

Question: What, if any, training will be provided to your staff on what it means to be an effective “team member?” We found in the program office that our people required team training.

Answer: Efforts are underway to define appropriate training. The Defense Acquisition University (DAU) has been tasked to update their curriculum by October 1995. Many of the courses already include training in the IPT process.

Question: As part of the drawdown of the Army, my PEO core staff has been reduced in size. Over a three-year period, its size has been reduced about 25%. We perceive out in the field that the OSD staff needs a similar size reduction. Are there any firm plans in OSD for reduction in staff size?

Answer: OSD Staffs have roles apart from the IPT process. They support their principal and deal with other issues (e.g., Congressional inquiries, Planning Programming Budgeting System (PPBS). DoD has already taken acquisition workforce reductions. The OSD staff is shrinking over the POM years: 3% in FY95 and 5% each year thereafter. In addition, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) direction regarding staff augmentation, now being formalized by a DoD Directive, will effectively reduce OSD staff even further in FY96. The net effect will be a percentage reduction of the OSD staff, including A&T, at least as great as the reductions to the Service acquisition workforces. In addition, Dr. Kaminski has commissioned a review of the way the USD(A&T) organization is structured, given the new IPT way of working. IPTs are one way of effectively and efficiently using this smaller workforce. We will need to make further reductions in infrastructure in order to reduce costs. To the extent that IPTs can identify non-value/redundant work, they will help guide infrastructure reduction efforts.

IPT MEETINGS

Question: How often do you envision the working level IPT meet, or can any of the 30+ members call for an IPT meeting?

Answer: IPTs meet as often as necessary to work and resolve issues. Working level IPTs will meet as necessary, to produce a specified product, review progress and resolve issues. However, regular “update” meetings should not be conducted. The OIPT will meet only to resolve the most

significant issues and to determine program readiness and review plans for the next phase.

Question: Do you see a danger in OSD of every problem having an IPT to supposedly solve it (danger of overuse/abuse of IPTs)?

Answer: Yes. IPTs are not intended to solve every problem. IPTs are focused on building successful acquisition programs: develop affordable and executable strategies and plans; identify and resolve issues early; and, provide continuous early insight to the MDA. We need to make sure that the IPT philosophy does not become a cult, in order to productively use our personnel resources, especially in this era of downsizing.

MAISRC

Question: The off-site presentations focused on the Defense Acquisition Board (DAB) and DAB programs. What are the plans for implementing this concept in the Major Automated Information Systems Review Council (MAISRC) process? Any plans for specific Automated Information Systems (AISs)?

Answer: It is both Dr. Kaminski's and Mr. Paige's desire to integrate the MAISRC and DAB processes--to use similar principles and processes to accomplish their function. The rewrite of DoDD 5000.1 and DoDI 5000.2 will fully integrate the 8000 series documents. However, the MAISRC will still exist as a separate body, and AISs will continue to have separate thresholds.

ROLE OF THE COMPTROLLER

Question: In the past it has appeared that, despite comptroller participation in the DAB, comptroller funding recommendations do not reflect program decisions made by the DAB. Will the comptroller participate in the IPT? Will the comptroller funding recommendations and decisions be consistent with DAB/OIPT acquisition strategies?

Answer: The Comptroller is a member of both the Defense Resources Board (DRB) and the DAB. We expect that the Comptroller will participate in the process of building successful programs. As stated by the Director, Investments, the Comptroller representatives would be empowered

representatives. That is not to say that later in a fiscal year or under different circumstances, the program will not undergo reductions.

Question: How can we expect program managers and PEOs to dialogue openly about funding issues or cost savings initiatives with comptroller team members given the objective that comptroller people often have to find funds for other shortfalls?

Answer: The IPT process can help people at all levels involved in PPBS to understand programs. There are instances when the PPBS is not fully integrated with the acquisition management or the IPT process. However, the IPT process will keep the Comptroller and the DAE better informed, thus facilitating more enlightened PPBS decisions.

ROLE OF THE DOD IG

Question: How do we reconcile the punitive nature of the DoD Inspector General (IG) with streamlining and innovative initiatives which can always be second guessed?

Answer: The Inspector General (IG), DoD, has been a helpful participant in process action teams, working groups, and developing legislative proposals for acquisition reform. Further, DoD IG has stated publicly a desire to be more helpful to the Department for reform initiatives and problem resolution. The DoD IG has a statutory role to perform audits. Auditing by its nature looks at what has been done and how things can be done better in the future. In the acquisition process, the DoD IG has an auditing role, but he is not a member of the Defense Acquisition Board (DAB) because the DoD IG is not a part of the management decision process. In addition, Dr. Kaminski requested the DoD IG, along with the component inspection and audit organizations, to review the feasibility of consolidating the scheduling of all acquisition management audits and inspections at the DoD level and to schedule cyclic audits and inspection of any one program on a biennial schedule, except in cases of fraud, waste, or abuse. The results of that review are due to Dr. Kaminski in October 1995. Also, the DoD IG is working with the Component audit and inspection organizations on developing an automated system that will show all ongoing and planned audits and inspections of acquisition programs. Further, the report will show the locations or programs where the audit or inspection will be performed. Reports from the system will be made available to the acquisition community in the fall of 1995.

DOCUMENTATION

Question: OSD has defined a management process. Has the senior management looked at the level of documentation necessary to support that process—particularly with an eye toward relieving documentation burdens on PMs?

Answer: Yes. Dr. Kaminski has moved to a “tailored-in” philosophy of documentation and has directed the Services/Agencies to examine their documentation requirements. We all have to accept that there will always be documentation to meet statutory requirements, provide good management, and provide an audit trail of decisions and rationale. The documentation will be streamlined and tailored to each situation by the OIPT. This philosophy is being incorporated in the rewrite of the DoDD 5000.1 and DoDI 5000.2.

Question: The Systems Acquisition Management Plan (SAMP) is described as summary document. As such, does that mean it summarizes information found in other existing documents and is not intended to replace them?

Answer: The intent of creating a single document is to provide the decisionmaker with the opportunity to approve a program’s direction as described in its acquisition strategy, etc, early—prior to final Request For Proposal (RFP) release. The SAMP is a term first use by the Air Force for a single, consolidated document. The objective of the SAMP, or any SAMP-like document, is to meet the needs of the decisionmaker while providing only the essential information to make the decision. Our intent is to eliminate stand alone documents that have, in the past, resulted in unnecessary duplication of information. This concise document will be complete and not summarize other documents, and it will be updated as program information changes. The SAMP-like document meets the needs of the decisionmaker. It does not replace the various program plans required and prepared by the PMO; they are not provided to the MDA unless required by statute.

Question: Will all programs be required to produce a SAMP? When will we receive guidance on the acceptable SAMP format?

Answer: There is no such thing as an “acceptable” SAMP format. The SAMP is a concept. Each program will, to the maximum extent practical,

prepare a single document that is tailored to the individual program. It will contain: the information required by statute, the information requested by the MDA, and the information necessary for the MDA to make his decision. What was contained in the Space Based Infrared System (SBIR) SAMP won't necessarily apply to a missile, tank, aircraft, or ship program. Moreover, the SBIR SAMP probably doesn't contain all of the information required for those other kinds of weapons programs. Even all aircraft programs may not require the same information, based upon their acquisition approach, program phase, and technical risk.

When preparing the program's documentation, the PM must consider what information has been requested by the MDA. This will normally be determined by the OIPT prior to or early in the program phase so that the PM can plan for that requirement as he executes his program, provides feedback to the MDA, and ultimately prepares for the next milestone decision review. The single document is expected to contain strategies that need to be approved by the MDA and other information which the MDA requires in order to make his decision. It will not contain detailed management plans. With the exception of the TEMP, which by statute must be approved by OSD, other detailed management plans (such as the ILS plan, the program management plan, producibility plan, etc.) are PM working tools and they shall not be required as reports to the OSD or Component Headquarters staff organizations. Bottom line: there will be no standard format--no cookie-cutter approach. Each PM shall tailor his/her SAMP-like document to the program needs.

INSTITUTIONALIZING THE IPT/OIPT PROCESS

Question: It is obvious that the various PMs will be innovative in streamlining the acquisition process by streamlining the subprocesses. How will these ideas be captured, shared and historically preserved for use across OIPTs?

Answer: As part of the DoD 5000 documents rewrite, which will divide the current guidance into mandatory and discretionary, an Acquisition Deskbook will be created. The Acquisition Deskbook will provide automated, on-line, real-time access to acquisition management policies, practices, lessons-learned, and current management tools promoting the adoption and practice of sound systems management principles. As DoD's primary reference tool, relied upon for promoting systems acquisition management excellence, it will be the vehicle for capturing, sharing, and preserving process innovations.

Question: Each service has a different approach to working level IPTs. Are there any processes (agenda, meeting minutes, agreement memos, etc.) that should be standardized across DoD?

Answer: DoD wants to encourage flexibility, innovation and tailoring in executing the IPT concept; it does not want to mandate organizational structures, procedures or formats. However, A&T/API is to publish “rules of the road” providing guidance on conducting successful IPTs. The rules will speak to such common-sense activities as the need for advanced and coordinated scheduling, agenda development, and publication of meeting minutes.

PRE-MILESTONE 0 IPTS

Question: Does the IPT concept apply to pre-milestone 0 situations, such as ACTDs? If so, how?

Answer: IPT is a concept to bring all major stakeholders together to solve a particular issue or to perform a particular function. For example, IPTs are currently being held on various ACTDs to develop plans for how and at what point that ACTD will enter the formal acquisition process.

Question: Please explain the apparent disparity between the decision process described on your (i.e., Dr. Schneiter’s) “Life Cycle Cost Performance IPT” slide and your “Accelerated Decision Making” slide. Why do recommendations for cost savings changes have to go through the ORD approval authority, Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) and OIPT for review before approval by DAE? Aren’t “requirements” communities empowered for IPT activity?

Answer: The requirements community will play a very active role in any discussions regarding cost-performance trades. Should those discussions result in recommendations to change key performance parameters, the JROC, which is the only body empowered to validate them, must approve the changes. The Cost Performance IPT (CPIPT) and the OIPT can make recommendations with that end in mind.

PROGRAM “REBASELINING”

Question: Please clarify what “rebaselining” a program means.

Answer: Rebaselining does not refer to Acquisition Program Baselines. When used in the OIPT context, the term “rebaselining” refers to the direction included in Dr. Kaminski’s April 28 memorandum. That direction required the OIPT leader and the SAE to identify candidate programs, recommend the IPT approach to be taken, and to specify the next and future review points for the program to include the appropriate level of decision authority. The SAEs have identified the programs, and the rebaselining effort is underway.

Question: How do IPTs relate to implementing IPPD?

Answer: IPPD is a management technique that simultaneously integrates all essential acquisition activities through the use of multidisciplinary teams to optimize the design, manufacturing, and supportability process. IPTs are key to making the IPPD work.

IPTs include representatives from all appropriate functional disciplines working together to build successful programs and enable decision makers to make the correct decisions at the right time. In addition to the PMO-contractor IPTs established to manage program execution, two types of IPTs, the Overarching IPT (OIPT) and the working level IPTs, have been established to facilitate building more successful and affordable programs, resolve problems, and gain early insight for program insight.

The OIPT, consisting of senior Service and OSD staff representatives and functional directors, provides strategic guidance to the program office. The OIPT is focused on tailoring the program structure and execution to that which is applicable to the program and satisfies the needs of the MDA. The OIPT will provide strategic direction towards developing affordable and executable programs. Additionally, the OIPT, through early and continuous insight, will identify and resolve concerns and issues in a timely manner, keeping programs on track.

The working level IPTs, consisting of staff and functional representatives from both OSD and the Services, will support the PM by developing the integrated strategies and plans that execute the top level guidance and recommendations provided by the OIPT. The working level IPTs are largely focused on the programmatic details, e.g., contracting, testing, management, etc., required to execute the program. Also, each Service will establish a management or integrating IPT to integrate the efforts and resolve issues resulting from other working level IPTs. IAW the Program Manager’s Bill of Rights, that Integrating IPT will normally be led by the PM, who is responsible for the overall management of his program – unless the SAE decides otherwise.

The objective is to make the program successful by preparing affordable and executable strategies and plans, that are tailored to the program requirements.

FOREIGN INVOLVEMENT

Question: Global economy; increasingly global industrial base; coalition warfare strategies; diminishing resources: any thought toward involving our allies in the IPT process?

Answer: The DoDD 5000.1 will continue to encourage international cooperation. The statutory requirement for a Cooperative Opportunity Document (COD) still exists, although now it will be done by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Economic Security) Staff. IPTs will be formed when planning begins, prior to program initiation. International cooperative programs could have foreign government representatives at the working IPT level or OIPT level, as a full member of the process.

METRICS

Question: The perception has been that the OSD staff measure of success was finding problems/issues. Why not use program success as the measure of merit?

Answer: DUSD(AR) is presently working to define metrics into two categories, process and outcome. Process metrics would measure some of our efforts to streamline the process, like less documentation to support a decision interview. Outcome metrics would attempt to measure program successes such as reducing the time it takes to develop a weapon system. Part of the change directed by Secretary Perry is to move from “checking” programs to building successful programs, resulting in a shift in emphasis on the part of the OSD Staff. However, focusing on building successful programs does not mean that unsuccessful programs should not be identified and canceled.

A NEW WAY OF DOING BUSINESS

Question: After listening to everything said so far, how can I be ensured this is not business as usual (or more) under a new name? (Especially from an OSD perspective)

Answer: There are a number of key differences detailed in the responses to other questions that substantially change the way we will do business in the department. With our collective commitment, they will improve the way we acquire systems for our warfighters.